



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,762	07/22/2003	Gozde Bozdagi	98228D	6508

7590 07/05/2007
Patent Documentation Center
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20th Floor
100 Clinton Ave. S.
Rochester, NY 14644

EXAMINER

VU, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/624,762	Applicant(s) BOZDAGI ET AL.	
	Examiner Thanh T. Vu	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 04/03/2007

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claims 1 and 12 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 1-8, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratakonda (U.S. Pat. No. 5,956,026) and Jain et al. ("Jain", U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,444).

Per claim 1, Ratakonda teaches a multimedia image data signal browsing and parsing graphical user interface comprising:

a key frame video display area displaying at least one representative frame located by a find key frame widget from an input multimedia image data signal (col. 13, lines 22-23; *a user can locate and view a frame*);

a cuts video display area displaying cuts located by a find cuts widget in the input multimedia image data signal (fig. 5; col. 13, lines 25-30; *different level of cuts (video summary) are displayed*);

a plot video display area displaying plots generated by a plots widget and graphically illustrating statistics relating to the input multimedia image data signal (fig. 5; col. 3, lines 30-38; col. 4, lines 46-59; col. 13, lines 13-19; *different levels of video summary are graphically illustrating statistics of video data because key frames are selected based on statistics (color histograms computation) of video data*) ; and

a play video display area displaying a portion of the input multimedia image data signal played by a play widget (col. 3, lines 55-57; col. 13, lines 29-35; *a user can play back the video between any two key frames*).

Ratakonda does not specifically teach representative frames are located based on analysis of command data within the multimedia image data signal, wherein the command data includes closed-caption information. However, Jain teaches representative frames are located based on analysis of command data within the multimedia image data signal, wherein the command data includes closed-caption information (col. 6, lines 47-50; col. 9, lines 29-36; *extract a key frame based on event criteria e.g. cc-text "Clinton".*) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include key frame extraction method as taught by Jain in the invention of Ratakonda in order to provide a system that intelligently

Art Unit: 2174

extracts information from a video stream in real-time and to provide a foundation of a rich, frame-accurate index that would provide immediate, non-linear access to any segment of the video.

Per claim 2, Ratakonda teaches the user interface of claim 1 wherein the cuts video display area displays at least one discontinuous cut identified by the find cuts widget (fig. 5; col. 13, lines 25-30; *different level of cuts (video summary) are displayed*).

Per claim 3, Ratakonda teaches the user interface of claim 1 wherein the plot video display area displays plots resulting from parsing of the input multimedia image data signal, as well as determination of statistics relating to the input multimedia image data signal, by the plots widget (fig. 5; col. 3, lines 30-38; col. 4, lines 46-59; col. 13, lines 13-19; *different levels of video summary are graphically illustrating statistics of video data, because key frames are selected based on statistics (color histograms computation) of video data*).

Per claim 4, Ratakonda teaches the user interface of claim 1 wherein the key frame video display area displays at least one representative frame between at least two discontinuous cuts of the input multimedia data image having been identified by the find key frame widget (fig. 5; col. 56-61).

Per claim 5, Ratakonda teaches the user interface of claim 4 wherein the at least one representative frame is identified based on detected command data in the input multimedia data image (fig. 5, col. 13, lines 20-23).

Per claim 6, Ratakonda teaches the user interface of claim 4 wherein the at least one representative frame is identified based on a frame difference determination (col. 4, lines 48-54).

Per claim 7, Ratakonda teaches the user interface of claim 1 wherein the key frame video display area displays at least one representative frame between an end of the input multimedia data image and the least one discontinuous cut of the input multimedia data image having been identified by the find key frame widget (col. 3, lines 55-57; col. 4, lines 48-59).

Per claim 8, Ratakonda teaches the user interface of claim 1 further comprising a frame select widget that can select a frame of the input multimedia data image (col. 13, lines 20-26).

Per claim 12, Ratakonda teaches a method comprising:

identifying at least one representative frame of an input multimedia image, providing a video display area, and displaying the at least one representative frame in the video display area (fig. 5; col. 13, lines 15-27).

Ratakonda does not specifically teach representative frames are located based on analysis of command data within the multimedia image data signal, wherein the command data includes closed-caption information. However, Jain teaches representative frames are located based on analysis of command data within the multimedia image data signal, wherein the command data includes closed-caption information (col. 6, lines 47-50; col. 9, lines 29-36; *extract a key frame based on event criteria e.g. cc-text "Clinton".*) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include key frame extraction method as taught by Jain in the invention of Ratakonda in order to provide a system that intelligently extracts information from a video stream in real-time and to provide a foundation of a rich, frame-accurate index that would provide immediate, non-linear access to any segment of the video.

Per claim 13, Ratakonda teaches the method of claim 12 further comprising: identifying at least one cut in an input multimedia data image, displaying the least one cut in the video display area (col. 13, lines 26-35).

Per claim 14, Ratakonda teaches the method of claim 12 further comprising:
identifying at least one cut in an input multimedia data image, displaying the at least one cut in a cut display area (col. 13, lines 26-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratakonda Jain et al. ("Jain", U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,444), and Dow et al. ("Dow", pub. No.: 2001/0009428).

Per claims 9-11, the modified Ratakonda teaches the user interface of claims 1 and 8 as described above, but does not teach the user interface having a print command, a help command, and an info command interface. However, Dow teaches a user interface having a print command, a help command, and an info command ([0048]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Dow in the invention of the modified Ratakonda in order to provide user operation buttons for printing images and provide user with access to general tutorials and process animation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the amendment have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T. Vu

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100